

amendment to trim approximately \$240 million from the Subcommittee mark, including approximately \$135 million from the IRS (approximately \$139 million from the President's budget request). While I can appreciate the new budget constraints under which the Committee must operate, I am gravely concerned that a cut of \$135 million will seriously jeopardize the IRS's ability to implement its reform effort mandated by the Restructuring Act.

A funding reduction of \$135 million would: Severely restrict, if not completely impair, IRS' ability to deliver on the Restructuring and Reform Act mandated by the Congress in 1998. Every aspect of the agency's commitment to reorganize the organization, improve customer service and taxpayer rights would be in jeopardy.

Constrain the ability to implement the initiatives so critical to changing how IRS delivers on customer service and improves its treatment of taxpayers and focus on taxpayer rights. For example, the cut would result in reduced plans to deliver better telephone service and tax assistance in Spanish.

Require reduced staffing levels in order to free up the funds necessary to implement congressionally mandated RRA requirements. IRS staff has already been reduced 14% (or 15,600 FTE) since FY 1993—thereby continuing the rapid decline in exam, collection and criminal tax compliance operations.

Reduce finding for the Electronic Tax Administration program, thereby jeopardizing the Congressionally mandated goal of 80 percent electronic filing by the year 2007.

Impair the creation of operating units to help specialized groups of taxpayers including small businesses and ordinary wage earners.

Delay implementation of important taxpayer rights initiatives.

I sincerely hope that the \$135 million will be restored so that the IRS and Congress can achieve its mutual goal of meaningful IRS reform. I look forward to continuing to work with you and the rest of the Congress to ensure that the American people have the modernized revenue service that they deserve.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. ROSSOTTI,
Commissioner.

IN APPRECIATION OF JOSEPH E. CARTER, FEDERAL WORKER AND THOROUGHBRED HORSEMAN

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1999

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Joseph E. Carter on the fourth anniversary of his death from cancer, which occurred on July 31, 1995, at the age of 34. Mr. Carter was highly esteemed as a federal worker of great integrity while employed as one of the groundskeepers of the U.S. Capitol. He subsequently was a successful Thoroughbred groom and a respected clocker for "The Daily Racing Form," positions which he greatly enjoyed.

As kind and generous as he was physically powerful, Mr. Carter was quick to help anyone in need, without thought of repayment. This outstanding gentleman regularly helped the frail elderly and the widowed with his strenuous manual labor, and he was known to

drive 80 miles to obtain a second veterinarian's diagnosis regarding a dying horse, in order to try to save the animal's life.

A typical example of Mr. Carter's warm compassion was evidenced when he once offered to adopt a profoundly retarded boy and to give him a safe, affectionate home when it was no longer possible for the child's loving family to keep the boy with them.

When Mr. Carter learned that he was dying of inoperable cancer, he said quietly, "The Lord gave me 29 good years, and I'm thankful. I'm going to die of cancer, but I'm not going to let it defeat me."

Mr. Carter was a credit to his upbringing who died undefeated by the terrible pain which he endured in his last years. The loving son of Bill and Kathy Carter of Brandywine, Maryland, Mr. Carter died with the same dignity and compassion with which he lived. His calm courage and optimism remain an inspiration to those who knew him.

LEHIGH VALLEY HEROS—SHAWN
AND KEVIN KELLY

HON. PATRICK J. TOOMEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1999

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share my Report from Pennsylvania for my colleagues and the American people.

All across Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District there are some amazing people who do good things to make our communities a better place. These are individuals of all ages who truly make a difference and help others.

I like to call these individuals Lehigh Valley Heroes for their good deeds and efforts.

Today I would like to recognize Kevin and Shawn Kelly of Wilson Borough as Lehigh Valley Heroes. These young boys have truly made a difference in their community.

Kevin, 8, and his brother Shawn, 11, recently extinguished a fire that threatened a nearby home in their community. Recently, they were playing outside when they noticed smoke coming from a grassy area near their neighbor's home. Kevin and Shawn reacted instantly to douse the small fire with water and as a result saved a neighbor's home.

These brave young boys made a difference in Wilson Borough and therefore they are Lehigh Valley Heroes in my book.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my Report from Pennsylvania.

THE AMERICAN MILITARY HEALTH
PROTECTION ACT

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1999

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue of vital importance to our men and women in uniform.

Since the end of the Cold War, the Army and Air Force have been reduced by 45 per-

cent, the Navy by 36 percent, and the Marine Corps by 12 percent.

At the same time, our military operations commitments around the world have increased by 300 percent.

The Army alone has participated in 33 separate deployments since 1992, and has troops in over 70 nations.

Our military readiness is stretched thin, our reserves of critical missiles and spare parts have eroded, and our military's quality of life is diminishing.

Retention rates are reaching historic lows and aircraft accidents are climbing.

For too long we have been asking our military to do more with less.

In recent years, this Congress has taken many steps to reverse these trends and provide adequate training and equipment for our Armed Forces personnel. We must continue to do more.

Despite these difficulties, our men and women remain the premier military in the world.

Their devotion and commitment to serve is without question.

Time and again, they risk their lives in the defense of our nation and our interests around the world.

Without their selfless dedication, our nation would not be the great place it remains today.

As such, we in Congress and as a nation, have a responsibility to those military personnel and their families.

We owe them the strongest commitment to their safety and well being we can provide.

However, I am concerned our government may be violating that very principle.

Two years ago the Secretary of Defense announced plans to implement a mandatory anthrax vaccination program for the 2.4 million members of the Armed Forces.

Since that time, I heard from a rapidly growing number of military personnel and family members who believe this vaccine may jeopardize their long-term health and safety as well as that of their families.

The lack of a single, conclusive independent study regarding the long-term health effects of the anthrax vaccine on humans have created additional concerns among our nation's uniformed personnel.

Despite Department of Defense assurances of minimal adverse reactions to the anthrax vaccinations, the standards that the Department uses to determine adverse reactions are insufficient to support their claims.

According to a June 29 article in the San Diego Union-Tribune, Secretary of the Army Louis Caldera acknowledged in a September 1998 memo that the vaccine "involves unusually hazardous risks associated with the potential for adverse reactions in some recipients and the possibility that the desired immunological effect will not be obtained by all recipients."

The article went on to report that the Secretary concluded, there is no certainty that the anthrax used in tests to measure the vaccine's effectiveness "will be sufficiently similar to the pathogen that U.S. forces might encounter" during warfare.

If the Secretary of one of the services raises these concerns, how can we as a nation expect the most junior soldier, sailor, airman, or

July 16, 1999

Marine to accept the vaccine without question?

As a result of the lack of conclusive data on the long-term effects of the anthrax vaccine, many of these military personnel are being forced to make decisions between the safety and security of their families that their dedication and commitment to serving our nation.

In a time when all branches of our military are faced with severe challenges in recruiting and retaining quality military personnel, we should be looking for ways to recruit and retain these men and women.

Instead, over 200 personnel have chosen to resign from the armed services rather than accept the risks associated with a questionable vaccination program.

In one Connecticut Air National Guard Unit alone, eight pilots resigned their commissions because of the mandatory anthrax vaccination. There are growing reports of large numbers of other Guard units whose ranks are shrinking for the same reason.

In my own state of North Carolina, I have heard from numerous active duty and reserve Air Force pilots who have tendered their resignation after many years of service.

However, I am particularly troubled by the recent court-martial of five Marines for their refusal to accept the anthrax vaccination.

As the representative of one of the largest Marine Corps bases in the country, Camp Lejeune, I have learned how much they value their creed: "Corps, God, and then Country."

For the Marines, it is not just a saying; it is a way of life.

Yet, because of the great uncertainty surrounding the anthrax vaccine, a growing number of Marines are also choosing to leave their beloved Corps, their livelihood, to ensure their long-term health and that of their families.

All of these matters have led me to a single conclusion. Until the questions surrounding the anthrax vaccine are answered, I cannot in good conscience support the current mandatory Department of Defense vaccination program.

I feel as though I would be failing in my responsibility if I did not take action to protect the troops who willingly sacrifice their own lives in defense of this nation and its citizens.

As a result, today I am introducing the American Military Health Protection Act.

The legislation is simple.

It would make the current Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccination Immunization Program voluntary for all members of the Uniformed Services until either:

1. The Food and Drug Administration has approved a new anthrax vaccination for humans; or

2. The Food and Drug Administration has approved a new, reduced shot course for the anthrax vaccination for humans.

It does not eliminate the program or remove the ability of the Department of Defense to provide anthrax vaccinations. It simply ensures before a member of our military is required to take the vaccine, their questions about its safety and long-term effects are answered.

It is the least that Congress and the Department of Defense can do.

I hope my colleagues here will see that and join me in protecting the great men and women of the United States Military.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNION CITY CELEBRATES 40TH ANNIVERSARY AND DESIGNATION AS AN ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, 1999, Union City, California will celebrate its 40th Anniversary and its recent designation by the National Civic League as an All-American City, one of only ten in the United States for 1999. Although the City of Union City will be celebrating its 40th Anniversary in 1999, the year 1850 marks the date that settlers John and William Horner visited an oasis by the Bay and laid out a small settlement town eight square blocks which they called "Union City." It is said that the name originates from the Horners' Sacramento River steamer call "The Union."

In the early 1850's, Union City had a total population of just three families. This is in stark contrast to the nearly 64,000 residents who inhabit the City today. Many of Union City's early settlers were disappointed gold miners who found that growing potatoes, fruits, and vegetables could also be quite profitable and rewarding. Most of the vegetables grown in California were shipped from Union City as this area was considered to be the most fertile agricultural land in the state.

By 1852, Union City had developed into a town that had several hotels, numerous boarding houses, livery stables, general stores, a blacksmith shop, and a men's furnishing store among others. The coming years saw major industries start to settle in the area, such as Pacific Coast Sugar Company and Gold Medal Flower.

Much of the area that is now Union City was spared with little damage during the earthquake of 1906. However, Union City faced a new challenge in the 1950's when several adjacent cities targeted Union City for possible annexation. To prevent this from happening, Union City residents decided to successfully incorporate the city in 1959.

Present day Union City is known as the Gateway to the Silicon Valley. With a diverse population of almost every imaginable ethnicity, Union City exemplifies the true American spirit. Civic-minded communities continue to work tirelessly for safe neighborhoods, quality housing and exemplary schools.

I am proud to represent Union City in my 13th Congressional District, and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding city on its 40th birthday and designation as All-American City for 1999.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

16499

consideration the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Congressmen WELDON and BARR.

This amendment would accomplish two goals.

First, it would undermine the Constitutional responsibility that our government has towards Native American Tribes.

Second, it would serve to stop so much of the positive work that is being accomplished in Indian Country.

What my colleagues need to understand is that Tribal Gaming is not a private interest initiative. The proceeds from Tribal Gaming can only be used for governmental programs like education, health care and housing.

Some Tribes that are looking to take lands into trust for the purposes of gaming currently have unemployment rates in excess of 50 percent. Native Americans are simply looking for a way out of what is clearly third world poverty.

This amendment would prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from promulgating Class III gaming procedures.

The reason that the Department of Interior has published regulations on Class III gaming is because Congress, by enacting the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, directed the Secretary to develop procedures for Class III gaming compacts.

And lets be clear, Interior's regulations will apply in cases where tribes and states could not reach a Class III agreement but the state already allows Class III gaming activities, and when a state raises immunity as a defense from suit.

Moreover, states could still protect themselves from Class III gaming if they choose by outlawing any kind of Class III gaming in the state. In this regard Tribes could not game under Class III. Examples of States that have no gaming include Utah and Hawaii.

This rule is the result of an extensive public process that began more than three years ago and speaks to the fact that the vast majority of states and tribes have bargained in good faith with each other. In fact, in the ten years since the enactment of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, over 200 compacts have been signed in 24 states.

Tribes deserve a fair opportunity. In many cases they have been denied that chance.

I understand that the National Gambling Impact Study Commission has called for a "pause" in gaming but this amendment does nothing but unfairly discriminate against the only people that use gaming revenues for altruistic purposes.

Moreover, it goes to the very heart of our nation's failure to defend what Tribal Governments are entitled to by virtue of their status as domestic dependent nations.

Why is there no amendment to limit the growth of gaming in Atlantic City? How about state governments that use lotteries everyday?

The reason is because you all feel that Indians are an easy target. Gaming opponents feel as though they need a quick fix to satisfy